

a content of a fluorine-containing surfactant is not more than 1% by weight on the basis of water.--

FI --13. The aqueous dispersion of Claim 12, wherein the fluorine-containing surfactant is at least one member selected from the group consisting of a fluorine-containing carboxylic acid represented by the formula: $X(CF_2)_nCOOH$ and $Y(CH_2CF_2)_mCOOH$ where n is an integer of 6 to 20, X is F or H, m is an integer of 6 to 13, and Y is F or Cl, an alkali metal salt thereof, an ammonium salt thereof, an amine salt thereof and a quaternary ammonium salt thereof. --

-- 14. The aqueous dispersion of Claim 12, wherein the fluorine-containing surfactant is an ammonium salt of perfluorooctanoic acid. --

-- 15. An aqueous dispersion of a vinylidene fluoride polymer, which comprises a vinylidene fluoride polymer having an average particle size of not more than 196.3 nm, wherein a solid content is from 30 to 50 % by weight, and a content of a fluorine-containing surfactant is not more than 2% by weight on the basis of water. --

-- 16. The aqueous dispersion of Claim 15, wherein the fluorine-containing surfactant is at least one member selected from the group

consisting of a fluorine-containing carboxylic acid represented by the formula:
 $X(\text{CF}_2)_n\text{COOH}$ and $Y(\text{CH}_2\text{CF}_2)_m\text{COOH}$ where n is an integer of 6 to 20, X is F or H, m is an integer of 6 to 13, and Y is F or Cl, an alkali metal salt thereof, an ammonium salt thereof, an amine salt thereof and a quaternary ammonium salt thereof. --

FI
-- 17. The aqueous dispersion of Claim 15, wherein the fluorine-containing surfactant is an ammonium salt of perfluorooctanoic acid. --

REMARKS

In the foregoing amendments, Claims 12-17 were added to the application. These claims are supported in Comparative Examples 4 and 5 on pages 12 and 13 of the present application. Accordingly, Claims 6-17 are in the application for consideration by the Examiner.

Claim 6 was rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over Claim 1 of U.S. Patent No. 5,925,705. The Official Action stated that although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the claim of the instant application encompasses the claim of the patent. In response to this rejection, applicant is attaching an appropriate terminal disclaimer hereto and the statutory disclaimer fee in the amount of